



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/564,035	02/23/2005	Hans-Jacob Fromreide	115852	1628
29078 7590 12/09/2009 CHRISTIAN D. ABEL ONSAGERS AS POSTBOKS 6963 ST. OLAVS PLASS OSLO, N-0130 NORWAY				
EXAMINER CHIESA, RICHARD L				
ART UNIT 1797		PAPER NUMBER		
NOTIFICATION DATE 12/09/2009		DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

vest@onsagers.no
hilde.vestli@onsagers.no

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/564,035

Applicant(s)

FROMREIDE ET AL.

Examiner

Richard L. Chiesa

Art Unit

1797

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on November 27, 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 5-9 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 28 February 2008 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/GS-08)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date Nov. 27, 2009

DETAILED ACTION

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after allowance or after an Office action under *Ex Parte Quayle*, 25 USPQ 74, 453 O.G. 213 (Comm'r Pat. 1935). Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, prosecution in this application has been reopened pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicants' submission filed on November 27, 2009 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicants advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later

invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

4. Claims 1 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Japanese Patent No. 10-170071 to Matsushita in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,302,945 to Altman et al. Matsushita (note Abstract and drawing figure accompanying the abstract) shows an air purification device with an electrical collecting plate 11, electric resistance heating element 2, water supply spray nozzle 8, fan 3, and a cylinder having a restriction (note baffles near outlet 5) substantially as claimed. It would appear that Matsushita may not explicitly state that the collecting plate is made of metal. In any case, Altman et al (note Figures 1-7) teach the well-known use of metal collecting plates in an electrostatic precipitator air purification apparatus for the purpose of ensuring maximum cleaning (note col. 6, line 67 to col. 7, line 57). Consequently, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to employ metal collecting plates in the Matsushita air purification device in order to facilitate plate cleaning as taught by Altman et al.

5. Claims 2 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the prior art as applied to claim 1 in paragraph 4 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,251,170 to Hironaka et al. The prior art, as described above in paragraph 4, discloses an air purification apparatus substantially as claimed with the apparent exceptions of a 700 watt output and a temperature of about 500°C. However, Hironaka et al teach the use of these well-known expedients in an air purification device for the purpose of ensuring the decomposition of

unwanted pollutants (note col. 6, line 33 to col. 7, line 52) and it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to employ these expedients in the prior art air purification apparatus described above.

Allowable Subject Matter

6. Claims 5-9 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

7. Claim 4 would be allowable if rewritten to include all of the limitations of the independent claim 1 and if amended to define the metal plate as being the metallic cylinder.

8. As allowable subject matter has been indicated, applicants' reply must either comply with all formal requirements or specifically traverse each requirement not complied with. See 37 CFR 1.111(b) and MPEP § 707.07(a).

Conclusion

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicants' disclosure. These references have been cited as art of interest to show other air purification systems.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Richard L. Chiesa whose telephone number is (571) 272-1154.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Duane S. Smith, can be reached at (571) 272-1166.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Technology Center 1700 receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-1700.

Facsimile correspondence must be transmitted through (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Richard L. Chiesa
December 4, 2009

**/Richard L. Chiesa/
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1797**